

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

In the Office Action mailed June 11, 2009, claims 1, 2, and 4-10 were rejected. Additionally, claims 3 and 11-14 were objected to, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. In response, Applicants hereby request reconsideration of the application in view of the amendments and the below-provided remarks.

For reference, claims 1, 3, 4, 8, 9, and 11-14 are amended. In particular, claim 1 is amended to recite several limitations previously recited in claim 3. Accordingly, claim 3 is amended to remove the limitations now recited in claim 1. Similarly, claims 4, 8, and 9 are each amended to recite limitations previously recited in claims 11, 12, and 13, respectively, and claims 11, 12, and 13 are each amended to remove the limitations now recited in claims 4, 8, and 9. These amendments are supported, for example, by the subject matter described at page 12, line 18, through page 13, line 2, of the originally filed specification. Also, claim 14 is amended to remove several limitations, similar to claims 3 and 11-13.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicants appreciate the Examiner's review of the claims and determination that claims 3 and 11-14 recite allowable subject matter. In particular, the Office Action states that claims 3 and 11-14 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Additionally, while the previous Office Action provides a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter, the statement is directed to specific aspects of certain claims and not necessarily all of the claims. Applicants note that the previous comments may have paraphrased the language of the claims and it should be understood that the language of the claims themselves set out the scope of the claims. Thus, it is noted that the claim language should be viewed in light of the exact language of the claim rather than any paraphrasing or implied limitations thereof.

Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103

Claims 1, 2, and 8-10 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freiberg et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,788,657, hereinafter Freiberg) in view of Higuchi et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0012383, hereinafter Higuchi). Additionally, claims 4-6 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Freiberg in view of Setty et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2003/0103469, hereinafter Setty) and further in view of Reefman et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2002/0163455, hereinafter Reefman).

However, Applicants submit that these claims are patentable over Freiberg, Higuchi, Setty, and Reefman in light of the amendments to the claims presented herein. In particular, each of the independent claims 1, 4, 8, and 9 is amended to recite allowable subject matter from claims 3, 11, 12, and 13, respectively. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request that the rejections of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the claims in view of the amendments and remarks made herein. A notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

At any time during the pendency of this application, please charge any fees required or credit any over payment to Deposit Account **50-4019** pursuant to 37 C.F.R. 1.25. Additionally, please charge any fees to Deposit Account **50-4019** under 37 C.F.R. 1.16, 1.17, 1.19, 1.20 and 1.21.

Respectfully submitted,

/mark a. wilson/

Date: August 31, 2009

Mark A. Wilson
Reg. No. 43,994

Wilson & Ham
PMB: 348
2530 Berryessa Road
San Jose, CA 95132
Phone: (925) 249-1300
Fax: (925) 249-0111